Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

QUINTARA BIOSCIENCES, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

RUIFENG BIZTECH INC., et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. <u>20-cv-04808-WHA</u> (AGT)

ORDER RE: DISCOVERY DISPUTE

Re: Dkt. No. 116

Defendants have refused to provide plaintiff with the following discovery.

	Discovery at Issue	Requests
1.	Wang's application files for L-1 visa and green card involving Ruifeng or Quintara.	RFP Nos. 20, 21, as limited
2.	Subpoena to Henry R. Hu for Wang's immigration files related to Ruifeng or Quintara and for Hu's deposition.	Subpoena to Hu
3.	Communications, invoices, purchase orders between Ruifeng and its customers and vendors involving DNA sequencing business.	RFP No. 23, as limited
4.	Communications, invoices, purchase orders between RFB and its customers.	RFP No. 28, as limited
5.	Communications among Defendants involving Ruifeng, Quintara or RF Biotech.	RFP No. 26

Each of the RFPs at issue, as well as the subpoena to Hu (defendant Wang's immigration attorney), seeks information relevant to plaintiff's trade-secrets claim. Defendants have not convinced the Court that this discovery isn't proportional to the needs of the case. Nor have defendants persuaded the Court that, by requesting discovery related to Wang's immigration files, plaintiff is threatening "to present criminal, administrative, or disciplinary charges" against Wang to unfairly "obtain an advantage in a civil dispute." Cal. Rules of Prof'l Conduct 3.10(a)

(formerly Rule 5-100(A)). Defendants and Hu¹ must produce the discovery at issue, by May 14, 2021.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 10, 2021

ALEX G. TSE United States Magistrate Judge

¹ Hu hasn't appeared in the case, but Hu is an attorney of Wang's, and Wang hasn't suggested that Hu wasn't served with the subpoena, or that Hu objects on grounds different from those articulated by Wang in the parties' joint statement. As those grounds are unpersuasive, Hu must comply with the subpoena.